



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,617	09/15/2003	Mitchell A. Cohen	YOR920030243US1	9760
7590 Frederick W. Gibb, III McGinn & Gibb, PLLC Suite 304 2568-A Riva Road Annapolis, MD 21401		05/31/2007	EXAMINER TASHAKKORI, MITRA	
			ART UNIT 2109	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/662,617

Applicant(s)

COHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Mitra Tashakkori

Art Unit

2109

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the application filed on September 15, 2003, in which claims 1 to 45 are presented for examination.

Status of Claims

Claims 1 to 45 are rejected, of which claims 1, 10, 16, 24, 30, and 38 are in independent form.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the wording of the second sentence; more specifically, the phrase "In invention" is incorrect English. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The use of the trademarks Lotus®, Sametime®, and QuickPlace® has been noted in this application (pg. 6, [0025]). They should each be capitalized or distinguished with a proper trademark symbol (such as TM or ®) wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

The usage of a semicolon in the last sentence of paragraph [0023] (pg. 6), is incorrect.

Art Unit: 2109

The last sentence of paragraph [0036] (pg. 10) is incomplete; the phrase "encoded by node" should specify which node is being discussed.

The acronym "ISV" is used in paragraph [0046] (pg. 12) without any explanation of what it stands for.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-15 and 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 recites, "A system adapted to enable contextual collaboration within a computer network, comprising: a collaboration manager adapted to support manipulation of collaboration spaces, said collaboration spaces containing one or more collaboration elements having potentially different collaboration modalities; a context manager adapted to maintain resources and resource interrelationships within contexts, said resources including at least one of collaboration elements, processes, tasks, business objects, users, and roles; and a view generator adapted to select a set of said resources to be displayed to a user of said computer network." The collaboration manager, context manager, and view generator are software components, and the preamble of this claim is directed to the intended use of the system rather than a limitation of

Art Unit: 2109

the system's structure. The claim as a whole is directed to functional descriptive material without being in combination with a physical medium, and is considered software, per se, and is therefore directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1, and are therefore also directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 10 recites, "A system adapted to provide collaboration between different applications used by multiple users in a computerized network, said system comprising: at least one collaboration space supporting different modes of collaboration, wherein said users collaborate through said different applications using said different modes of collaboration maintained in said collaboration space; and application program interfaces connecting said collaboration space to said applications, thereby making collaboration content available to all said applications, such that all said collaboration content is transparently accessible by said users natively from within each application." The collaboration spaces, modes of collaboration, applications and application program interfaces are software components, and the preamble is of this claim is directed to the intended use of the system rather than a limitation of the system's structure. The claim as a whole is directed to functional descriptive material without being in combination with a physical medium, and is considered software, per se, and is therefore directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 11-15 are dependent on claim 10, and are therefore also directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2109

Claim 38 recites, "A service for enabling contextual collaboration within a computer network, wherein said service: creates collaboration spaces containing one or more collaboration elements of potentially different collaboration modalities; maintains resources and resource interrelationships within contexts, said resources including at least one of collaboration elements, processes, tasks, business objects, users, and roles; and selects a set of said resources to be displayed to a user." The claim, as a whole, is directed to a service, which is software, per se, and therefore is non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 39-45 are dependent on claim 38, and are therefore also directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1, the relationships between the collaboration manager, context manager, and view generator are unclear. One skilled in the art would not recognize how the components accomplish the goals set forth by the preamble.

Art Unit: 2109

As per claim 2, it depends on claim 1, and is rejected under the same analysis. Further, it is unclear what is meant by queries and more specifically, how the queries result in a context-sensitive view.

As per claims 3-9, they depend on claim 1 and are rejected under the same analysis.

As per claim 10, it is not clear how an application program interface that connects an application to a space inherently makes the content of the space transparently accessible to the application.

As per claims 11-15, they depend on claim 10 and are rejected under the same analysis.

As per claim 16, the relationships between the collaboration manager, context manager, and view generator are unclear. One skilled in the art would not recognize how the components accomplish the goals set forth by the preamble.

As per claim 17, the additional steps of the method of claim 16 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

As per claim 18, the additional steps of the method of claim 16 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

As per claim 19, the additional steps of the method of claim 16 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

Art Unit: 2109

As per claim 20, the additional steps of the method of claim 16 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

As per claim 21, the additional steps of the method of claim 16 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

As per claim 22, the additional steps of the method of claim 16 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

As per claim 23, the additional steps of the method of claim 16 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

As per claim 24, the metes and bounds of a “collaboration space” is unclear without impermissibly reading limitations of the specification into the claim.

As per claim 25-29, they depend on claim 24 and are rejected under the same analysis.

As per claim 30, the relationships between the collaboration manager, context manager, and view generator are unclear. One skilled in the art would not recognize how the components accomplish the goals set forth by the preamble.

As per claim 31, the additional steps of the method of claim 30 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished. Further, the preamble language directs the storage device itself to accomplishing steps of a method, rather than stating the method stored on the device comprises the additional steps.

As per claim 32, the additional steps of the method of claim 30 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 30 is accomplished.

As per claim 33, the additional steps of the method of claim 30 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 30 is accomplished.

As per claim 34, the additional steps of the method of claim 30 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 30 is accomplished.

As per claim 35, the additional steps of the method of claim 30 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 30 is accomplished.

As per claim 36, the additional steps of the method of claim 30 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 30 is accomplished.

As per claim 37, the additional steps of the method of claim 30 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 16 is accomplished.

As per claim 38, the relationships between the collaboration manager, context manager, and view generator are unclear. One skilled in the art would not recognize how the components accomplish the goals set forth by the preamble.

As per claim 39, the additional steps of the method of claim 38 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 38 is accomplished.

As per claim 40, the additional steps of the method of claim 38 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 38 is accomplished. Further, the term "if" in the preamble makes the claim indefinite, given that it is a conditional phrase. Under the circumstances that the condition set forth by this phrase is not met, the metes and bounds of this claim are entirely indefinite.

As per claim 41, the additional steps of the method of claim 38 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 38 is accomplished. Further, the term "if" in the preamble makes the claim indefinite, given that it is a conditional phrase. Under the circumstances that the condition set forth by this phrase is not met, the metes and bounds of this claim are entirely indefinite.

As per claim 42, the additional steps of the method of claim 38 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 38 is accomplished.

As per claim 43, the additional steps of the method of claim 38 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 38 is accomplished.

As per claim 44, the additional steps of the method of claim 38 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 38 is accomplished.

As per claim 45, the additional steps of the method of claim 38 still do not make it clear how the goal of the preamble of claim 38 is accomplished.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ruths et al.

US2003/0018719 A1 (hereinafter referred to as Ruths).

The main objective of the present application is to enable users of a network to collaborate with one another via any application, especially through applications that were not originally designed to be used with one another. Ruths teaches the same objective, and though the specific components and processes differ slightly from the present application, the overall invention is also directed to a infrastructure or platform that allows users to work collaboratively without limiting them to the use of specific software applications (pg. 1, [0006] to [0009]).

As per claim 1, Ruths discloses “*A system adapted to enable contextual collaboration within a computer network,*” as a “*collaborative platform [to] facilitate the development and deployment of a collaborative environment*” (pg. 1, [0010]) where users “may be coupled together through a network,” (pg. 1, [0011]). Also, Ruths states that “the collaborative environment may span different participants, applications, networks, devices and platforms to provide real-time collaboration,” (pg.1, [0010]). Ruths discloses “*a collaboration manager adapted to support manipulation of collaboration spaces,*” as a function of the collaborative platform where the platform “allows each participant application to collaborate over

Art Unit: 2109

collaborative objects, also referred to herein as collaborative data resources,” (pg. 1, [0011]). Ruths explains, “The application may provide a ‘window’ to the collaborative objects. An application may be the mechanism through which a user views and/or manipulates collaborative objects,” (pg.1, [0011]), thereby teaching the general functionality of a collaboration manager. Also, Ruths states, “A collaborative environment [. . .] may be viewed as the abstract collaborative space in which resources and participants may interact with each other. The collaborative environment includes connected local environments, and transcends any one collaborative platform” (pg. 4, [0057]). Thus, a collaborative space is primarily incorporated in Ruths as a collaborative environment. Ruths *discloses “said collaboration spaces containing one or more collaboration elements having potentially different collaboration modalities,”* as a feature of the collaborative platform, where the end result is that “participants do not need to include any special collaborative functionality of their own,” (pg. 1, [0011]) and discloses, “Participant applications, which use the collaborative data, become collaborative via the collaborative platform,” (pg. 3, [0050]). The present application specifies a collaboration space as being a collection of modality instances, where a collaboration modality is a distinct collaboration capability provided by a particular technology (pg. 5, [0023]). Ruths explains that a specific instance of a collaborative resource is termed a collaborative object (pg. 5, [0071]). It is noted that claim 1 recites a collaboration space containing collaboration elements, indicating the terms *collaboration element* and *modality instance* are synonymous. When a business application makes use of elements grouped within a collaboration space, that business application becomes collaborative. Similarly, Ruths states that when an application makes use of collaborative data, also referred to as collaborative resources, it becomes collaborative. Ruths primarily incorporates the collaboration manager, collaboration modality and collaboration element within the collaborative platform. Ruths discloses, “*a context manager adapted to maintain resources and resource interrelationships within contexts,*” as a

Art Unit: 2109

part of the collaborative platform, where a connectivity manager “may handle the creation and management of a session manager for each collaborative session,” (pg. 5, [0069]), and where a “session is a connection between two collaborative platforms such that they share some subset of their local environments,” (pg. 4, [0057]). Based on the specification, one example of a context is a business artifact (pg. 4, [0020], which is defined as interrelated aspects of a collaborative business project. Ruths primarily incorporates contexts within sessions and the collaborative platform, which also includes a session graph that documents the connections between environments (pg. 12, [0113]). Ruths discloses “*said resources including at least one of collaboration elements, processes, tasks, business objects, users, and roles*” as the collaborative data resources or objects, as discussed above. Ruths discloses, “*a view generator adapted to select a set of said resources to be displayed to a user of said computer network,*” as a feature of the collaborative platform which “allows each participant application to view the [resource] according to its own viewing capabilities,” (pg. 7, [0085]) and states that the platform may have “different permissions for different participants and resources within the collaborative environment,” (pg. 15, [0139]).

As per claim 2, Ruths discloses, “*The system in claim 1, further comprising an interface adapted to allow applications to specify commands to manipulate collaboration spaces, commands to maintain resources and resource interrelationships within contexts, and queries for context-sensitive views,*” as features of the collaborative platform as discussed above in the analysis of claim 1. Given that the only information in the specification of the instant application regarding *queries* is a list of example commands, the functionality of at least one of which is taught by Ruths (pg. 9, [0095] and pg. 12, [0110]), it is clear that, though there is no explicit mention of a query or search in Ruths, the instant application’s query feature is primarily incorporated as a capability of the collaborative platform.

As per claim 3, Ruths discloses, *"The system in claim 2, wherein said commands to manipulate collaboration spaces include: managing lifecycles of said collaboration spaces; maintaining membership lists, user profiles, and role associations in said collaboration spaces; adding and removing said collaboration elements; and performing modality-specific operations on said collaboration elements,"* as a kernel within the collaborative platform, where this kernel "may manage entry and removal of collaborative data resource representations" and "may maintain a collaborative data resource registration to which collaborative data resources may be registered and unregistered," (pg. 5, [0067]). Also, the use of a connection graphs (pg. 12, [0112], session graphs (pg. 12, [0113]), and relation graphs (pg. 12, [0114]) allows the platform to maintain information about the resources, which users are connected to each resource, the roles of each resource object, etc. The platform maintains and uses information on participants as well as performs specific operations on resource objects (pg. 12, [0111]).

As per claim 4, Ruths discloses, *"The system in claim 2, wherein said commands to maintain resources and resource interrelationships include: creating, deleting, opening, and closing of said contexts; adding resources and associations between said resources in said contexts; and removing said resources and said associations from said contexts,"* as portions of the collaborative platform discussed above in the analysis of claim 1. The platform maintains information on sessions and resources, as well as the relationships between resources. Ruths states, "During collaboration new content, new applications, new participants, and new resources may all be added at any time," (pg. 7, [0085]).

As per claim 5, Ruths discloses, *"The system in claim 2, wherein said queries for context-sensitive views include: retrieving resources related to a given context; retrieving*

Art Unit: 2109

resources related to a given resource within a context; and retrieving resources related to a given resource across contexts,” as features of the collaborative platform as discussed in claims 1-4 above.

As per claim 6, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 1, wherein said collaboration manager is operatively coupled to a collaboration space directory adapted to store information on collaboration spaces,”* as “collaborative data resources may be organized within a collaborative data resource graph,” (pg. 5, [0065]) and states that “a collaborative resource may be structured according to a directed graph, and structured data relationships may exist between collaborative data objects,” (pg. 9, [0093]). Ruths also states that “any type of content may be dynamically added to the collaborative environment and the collaborative platform may support providing other information needed by participants to recognize or use that added content,” (pg. 12, [0110]). The structured relationships maintained by the resource graph combined with the state information for each resource is equivalent to the instant claimed feature.

As per claim 7, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 6, wherein said collaboration manager is further operatively coupled to a collection of adapters adapted to connect to external collaboration capabilities, said adapters each implementing a standardized and modality-specific interface,”* as adapters which “provide an interface between the application and the collaborative platform,” (pg. 1 [0011]) and states that these adapters “may translate application-level interactions into modifications to the collaborative data and visa versa,” (pg. 1 [0012]). Ruths discloses that an adapter “may capture application events through hooks into an event model for the application” and states that these “hooks may be implemented [...] through a standard API,” (pg. 6, [0073]). Ruths also discloses “the collaborative platform on system B

Art Unit: 2109

forwards a modification command to system A so that the modification can be made,” (pg. 15, [0134]), which means the modification is performed through an external capability.

As per claim 8, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 1, wherein said context manager is operatively coupled to a context model adapted to describe associated resources and resource interrelationships,”* as a collaborative data resource relation graph, stating that “each collaborative data resource may be related to one or more other collaborative data resources according to a relation graph,” (pg. 12, [0114]).

As per claim 9. Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 1, wherein said view generator is operatively coupled to a set of view rules adapted to specify policies for view generation,”* as a capability of the resource objects to have dynamic command-behavior linking, stating that “command-behavior linking for a collaborative data resource representation may be adjusted according to the local environment,” (pg. 12, [0111]), allowing for a customized user display of collaboration content. Ruths states, “Collaborative resource objects may support a command-behavior paradigm. The command-behavior paradigm provides a pattern which separates syntax from semantics. [. . .] The linkings between syntactical elements and behavioral responses can be dynamically learned, changed, and modified. Thus, the linkings may be dynamic,” (pg. 16, [0148]). Ruths also states, “Dynamic linkings may also be created or modified. The dynamic linking process may include the specification of a map object in order to transform the specified command type (or command instance) into the arguments required by the behavior,” (pg. 17, [0149]). By providing this capability, the command to display content can produce a variety of results, based on adjustments made by each participant in their individual local environment. Thus, Ruths provides for creation and execution of specific policies for view

Art Unit: 2109

generation. Clearly, since specific behavior rules can be created and modified, Ruths primarily incorporates the rules that define view behaviors.

As per claim 10, Ruths discloses, *“A system adapted to provide collaboration between different applications used by multiple users in a computerized network, said system comprising: at least one collaboration space supporting different modes of collaboration, wherein said users collaborate through said different applications using said different modes of collaboration maintained in said collaboration space,”* as the collaborative platform discussed above, in the analysis of claim 1, where the collaborative resources or data objects allow different applications to become collaborative. Ruths states “the collaborative platform may provide for cross application collaboration and may support collaboration in heterogeneous computing environments,” (pg. 7, [0083]). Ruths discloses *“application program interfaces connecting said collaboration space to said applications, thereby making collaboration content available to all said applications, such that all said collaboration content is transparently accessible by said users natively from within each application,”* as a feature of the collaborative platform, where “to the application [. . .] it appears that the collaborative resource transcends the participants in that each participant application appears to have direct access to modify and/or observe the collaborative resource,” (pg. 5, [0072]).

As per claim 11, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 10, further comprising a contextual view generator adapted to select a limited set of resources maintained within said collaboration space to be displayed to a user of said computerized network based on user needs,”* as a feature of the collaborative platform, where it “allows each participant application to view the [resource] according to its own viewing capabilities,” (pg. 7, [0085]) and also discloses, “A collaborative data resource representations’ behavior may be dictated by or customized for its

Art Unit: 2109

local environment,” (pg.12 [0111]), allowing for a customized user display of collaboration content.

As per claim 12, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 10, further comprising a collaboration manager adapted to maintain said collaboration space,”* as the collaborative platform discussed above in the analysis of claim 1.

As per claim 13, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 12, wherein said collaboration manager is further adapted to create, delete, archive, and search and query said collaboration spaces,”* as features of the collaborative platform as discussed above in the analysis of claims 2 and 3.

As per claim 14, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 12, wherein said collaboration manager is further adapted to interact with collaboration technology servers,”* as “the collaborative environment may be used in conjunction with traditional client-server resources,” (pg. 15, [0137]).

As per claim 15, Ruths discloses, *“The system in claim 10, wherein said application program interfaces are adapted to create instances of collaborative interaction within said collaboration space,”* as a function of the collaborative platform, stating, “By using an externally available API as an interface to the collaborative platform, an existing application may be provided a means of interfacing with other collaborative resources including representations of collaborative resources that may be modified in a collaborative environment,” (pg. 7, [0082]).

As per claim 16, Ruths discloses, *“A method for enabling contextual collaboration within a computer network,”* as *“A method for collaborative computing”* (pg. 18, claim 9), where collaboration can be within a computer network, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 1. Ruths discloses, *“said method comprising: creating collaboration spaces, containing one or more collaboration elements of potentially different collaboration modalities; maintaining resources and resource interrelationships within contexts, said resources including at least one of collaboration elements, processes, tasks, business objects, users, and roles; and selecting a set of said resources to be displayed to a user,”* as functions of the collaborative platform, as discussed in the analysis of claim 1. Ruths discloses that resources are created by participant applications within a session, these resources and interrelationships are maintained within the collaborative platform, and by using these resources applications become collaborative. Also, the way in which collaborative content is displayed can vary from participant to participant.

As per claim 17, Ruths discloses, *“The method in claim 16, further comprising: managing lifecycles of said collaboration spaces; maintaining membership lists, user profiles, and role associations in said collaboration spaces; adding and removing said collaboration elements; and performing modality-specific operations on said collaboration elements,”* as a kernel within the collaborative platform, as discussed in the analysis of claim 3. Ruths also discloses, *“A collaborative data resource representations’ behavior may be dictated by or customized for its local environment,”* (pg.12 [0111]) and states, *“Collaborative resource objects may support a command-behavior paradigm,”* (pg. 16, [0147]) and that *“command-behavior linking for a collaborative data resource representation may be adjusted according to the local environment,”* (pg. 12, [0111]). Thus, Ruths allows for operations that take into consideration the characteristics of the resource object they are being performed upon.

Art Unit: 2109

As per claim 18, Ruths discloses *"The method in claim 16, wherein said maintaining process comprises: creating, deleting, opening, and closing said contexts; adding resources and associations between said resources in said contexts; and removing said resources and said associations from said contexts,"* as the connectivity manager discussed above, which includes a session manager, also discussed above in the analysis of claim 4. Both managers exist within a network engine, which "provides for connection to and disconnection from other collaborative platform network engines on remote participants," (pg. 5, [0068]). The collaborative platform contains the network engine, as well as a kernel to maintain resources and interrelationships, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 3.

As per claim 19, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 16, wherein said selecting process comprises: retrieving resources related to a given context; retrieving resources related to a given resource within a context; and retrieving resources related to a given resource across contexts,"* as features of the collaborative platform as discussed above in the analysis of claim 5.

As per claim 20, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 16, further comprising storing information on collaboration spaces,"* as a function of the collaborative platform or the collaborative data resource itself, where either "may maintain the connection, session, and relation graphs," (pg. 12, [0115]). As discussed above in the analysis of claim 3, these graphs store and maintain information about the resources.

As per claim 21, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 16, further comprising redirecting operations on said collaboration elements to external collaboration capabilities,"* as "the collaborative platform on system B forwards a modification command to system A so

Art Unit: 2109

that the modification can be made,” (pg. 15, [0134]), which means the modification is performed through an external capability.

As per claim 22, Ruths discloses, *“The method in claim 16, further comprising using a context model to describe resource associations and resource interrelationships,”* as a collaborative data resource relation graph, stating that “each collaborative data resource may be related to one or more other collaborative data resources according to a relation graph,” (pg. 12, [0114]). Also, Ruths states, “A collaborative data resource may be an object which [sic] for which a client-server distribution model of the collaborative data resource is maintained across the network,” (pg. 17, [0150]).

As per claim 23, Ruths discloses, *“The method in claim 16, further comprising maintaining a set of view rules adapted to specify policies for view generation,”* as a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above, in the analysis of claim 9.

As per claim 24, Ruths discloses, *“A method of providing collaboration between different applications used by multiple users in a computerized network, said method comprising: establishing at least one collaboration space supporting different modes of collaboration, permitting said users to collaborate through said different applications using said different modes of collaboration maintained in said collaboration space; and making collaboration content available to all said applications, such that all said collaboration content is transparently accessible by said users natively from within each application,”* as, “A method for collaborative computing” (pg. 18, claim 9), where collaboration can be within a computer network, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 10.

Art Unit: 2109

As per claim 25, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 24, further comprising selecting a limited set of resources maintained within said collaboration space to be displayed to a user of said computerized network based on user needs,"* as a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 11.

As per claim 26, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 24, further comprising maintaining said collaboration space using a collaboration manager,"* as a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 12.

As per claim 27, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 26, wherein said maintaining includes, creation, deletion, archival, and search and query of said collaboration spaces,"* as a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 13.

As per claim 28, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 26, wherein said maintaining includes said collaboration manager interacting with collaboration technology servers,"* as a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 14.

As per claim 29, Ruths discloses, *"The method in claim 24, further comprising creating instances of collaborative interaction within said collaboration space using application program interfaces,"* as a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 15.

As per claim 30, *"A program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for enabling contextual collaboration within a computer network, said method comprising: creating*

Art Unit: 2109

collaboration spaces containing one or more collaboration elements of potentially different collaboration modalities; maintaining resources and resource interrelationships within contexts, said resources including at least one of collaboration elements, processes, tasks, business objects, users, and roles; and selecting a set of said resources to be displayed to a user,” as a device with memory that stores executable program instructions that implement the collaborative platform (pg. 18, claim 16) as discussed above in the analysis of claim 16.

As per claim 31, Ruths discloses, “The program storage device in claim 30, further comprising: managing lifecycles of said collaboration spaces; maintaining membership lists, user profiles, and role associations in said collaboration spaces; adding and removing said collaboration elements; and performing modality-specific operations on said collaboration elements,” as is discussed above in the analysis of claim 17.

As per claim 32, Ruths discloses, “The program storage device in claim 30, wherein said maintaining process comprises: creating, deleting, opening, and closing said contexts; adding resources and associations between said resources in said contexts; and removing said resources and said associations from said contexts,” as is discussed above in the analysis of claim 18.

As per claim 33, “The program storage device in claim 30, wherein said selecting process comprises: retrieving resources related to a given context; retrieving resources related to a given resource within a context; and retrieving resources related to a given resource across contexts,” as is discussed above in the analysis of claim 19.

As per claim 34, *"The program storage device in claim 30, wherein said method further comprises storing information on collaboration spaces,"* as is discussed above in the analysis of claim 20.

As per claim 35, *"The program storage device in claim 30, wherein said method further comprises redirecting operations on said collaboration elements to external collaboration capabilities,"* as is discussed above in the analysis of claim 21.

As per claim 36, *"The program storage device in claim 30, wherein said method further comprises using a context model to describe resource associations and resource interrelationships,"* as is discussed above in the analysis of claim 22.

As per claim 37, Ruths discloses, *"The program storage device in claim 30, wherein said method further comprises maintaining a set of view rules adapted to specify policies for view generation,"* as is discussed above in the analysis of claim 22.

As per claim 38, Ruths discloses, *"A service for enabling contextual collaboration within a computer network, wherein said service: creates collaboration spaces containing one or more collaboration elements of potentially different collaboration modalities; maintains resources and resource interrelationships within contexts, said resources including at least one of collaboration elements, processes, tasks, business objects, users, and roles; and selects a set of said resources to be displayed to a user,"* as a software system that may "be downloaded (e.g. from the Internet) to the participant device," (pg. 5, [0059]), whose functionality is as discussed above in the analysis of claim 16.

Art Unit: 2109

As per claim 39, Ruths discloses, *"The service in claim 38, wherein said service further: manages lifecycles of said collaboration spaces; maintains membership lists, user profiles, and role associations in said collaboration spaces; adds and removes said collaboration elements; and performs modality-specific operations on said collaboration elements,"* a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 17.

As per claim 40, Ruths discloses, *"The service in claim 38, wherein if said service maintains said membership lists, said service: creates, deletes, opens, and closes said contexts; adds resources and associations between said resources in said contexts; and removes said resources and said associations from said contexts,"* a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 18.

As per claim 41, Ruths discloses, *"The service in claim 38, wherein if said service selects a set of resources to be displayed, said service: retrieves resources related to a given context; retrieves resources related to a given resource within a context; and retrieves resources related to a given resource across contexts,"* a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 19.

As per claim 42, Ruths discloses, *"The service in claim 38, wherein said service further stores information on collaboration spaces,"* a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 20.

As per claim 43, Ruths discloses, *"The service in claim 38, wherein said service redirects operations on said collaboration elements to external collaboration capabilities,"* a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 21.

As per claim 44, Ruths discloses, "*The service in claim 38, wherein said service uses a context model to describe resource associations and resource interrelationships,*" a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 22.

As per claim 45, Ruths discloses, "*The service in claim 38, wherein said service maintains a set of view rules adapted to specify policies for view generation,*" a feature of the collaborative platform, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 23.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 2005/0114789 A1 and US 2005/0114789 A1 are related copending applications, as is evident by the cross-reference identification and incorporation of disclosure of the present application in first paragraph of each reference. Both have at least one common inventor with and the same assignee as the present application.

US 2005/0262128 A1 is related in subject matter and has the same assignee and at least one common inventor as the present application. Furthermore, this application has been examined and amended, and the examiner has issued allowance. The references cited on that examiner's PTO-892 citations from the First Action and the Issue of Allowance are incorporated into the record of the present application and are included on the attached PTO-892.

Art Unit: 2109

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitra Tashakkori whose telephone number is 571-272-9069. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30am-5pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on 571-272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mitra Tashakkori



May 24, 2007


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER